

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/801,429

Applicant(s)

CARTER ET AL.

Examiner

R. James Balls

Art Unit

1625

## All Participants:

(1) R. James Balls.

(2) Julie Lappin.

## Status of Application: Pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 16 November 2006

Time: 2:00pm

## Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

All

Prior art documents discussed:


## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called to inquire about applicants proposed restriction. Applicants provided an alternative restriction wherein the species would be searched and examined instead of the generic claims. The proposed restriction, however, inadvertently included genus claims. Ms. Lappin confirmed that only claims 9-11 (drawn to species) were elected. .